

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Tradomark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/852,077	05/09/2001	Michiaki Sakamoto	12873A	4429	
75	90 12/05/2001				
Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser			EXAMINER		
400 Garden City Garden City, N			NGUYEN, DUNG T		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2871		
			DATE MAILED: 12/05/2001		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

* Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/852,077

Applicant(s)

Sakamoto

Examiner

Duna Nauven

Art Unit



		Dung Nguyen	28/1
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the corres	spondence address
Period 1	or Reply		
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH	H(S) FROM
af - If the be - If NO co	isions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C ter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communion period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days considered timely. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory mmunication.	cation. s, a reply within the statutory minimum period will apply and will expire SIX (6)	n of thirty (30) days will 6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this
- Any i ea	reply received by the Office later than three months after the rned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
Status 1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 12, 2	2001	,
2a) 🗌	This action is FINAL . 2b) 💢 This ac	tion is non-final.	
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under $Ex\ pa$	•	
Disposi	tion of Claims		
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>26-39</u>	is/are	e pending in the application.
4	la) Of the above, claim(s) <u>32-39</u>	is/ar	e withdrawn from consideration.
5) 🗆	Claim(s)		is/are allowed.
6) 💢	Claim(s) <u>26-31</u>		is/are rejected.
7) 🗌	Claim(s)		is/are objected to.
8) 🗆	Claims	are subject to restric	ction and/or election requirement.
Applica	tion Papers		
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10)□	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	e objected to by the Examiner.	
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) 🗀 approved	b) ☐ disapproved.
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	iner.	
13)💢	under 35 U.S.C. § 119 Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p $(A \cap B) \cap B \cap B$ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-{d}.
	1. \square Certified copies of the priority documents have	ve been received.	
	2. 🔀 Certified copies of the priority documents have		lo <i>09/363,868</i>
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority of application from the International Buresee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	this National Stage
_	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic		e).
Attachm	ent(s)		
15) 💢 N	otice of References Cited (PTC-892)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper	No(s)
16) 🗌 N	otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) Notice of Informel Patent Application	(PTO-152)
17) 💢 lm	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)3	20) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 09/852,077 Page 2

Art Unit: 2871

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the optical compensation films (e.g., positive and negative) forming between one of two substrates and a polarizing film (claims 26-27) must be shown or the feature(s) cancelled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Specification

2. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/852,077

Art Unit: 2871

Regarding claims 26-27, it is confusing and unclear how liquid crystal molecules can be aligned by applying a voltage to the optical compensation films. According to the LCD art, liquid crystal molecules would be aligned when applying a voltage to alignment layers which formed on the LCD substrates. Therefore, for the purpose of examination, it is assumed that liquid crystal molecules are felled when a voltage is applied to the alignment layers.

Regarding claims 28-31, as noted above, alignment layer will align the liquid crystal molecules in the liquid crystal layer from the initial state controlled by pretilt angle. Therefore, the alignment layer need to be irradiated (e.g, by UV light) to form pretilt angle on its surface (e.g, application, fig. 11). Therefore, it is assumed that Applicant tends to claim light irradiation forming the pretilt angle is conducted on the surface of the alignment layer from a slant direction.

Double Patenting

- 5. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 31. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to reject the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).
- 6. Claims 26-31 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 24-25 of copending Application No. 09/363,868. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both application disclose the same method of

Application/Control Number: 09/852,077

Art Unit: 2871

forming an LCD device and the method of forming an alignment layer by light instead of rubbing would have been obvious to one skilled in the art.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada et al., US Patent No. 5,852,485, in view of Xu et al., US Patent No. 6,023,317 and Kim et al., US Patent No. 5,889,571.

Regarding the above claims, Shimada et al. disclose an in-plane switching liquid crystal display (LCD) device having:

- a pair of substrate (21, 212);
- · a liquid crystal layer (217) formed therebetween;
- a thin film transistor (TFT);
- · a color filter (218);

Application/Control Number: 09/852,077 Page 5

Art Unit: 2871

• a common electrode (213) and a pixel electrode disposed between the color filter and the liquid crystal layer;

Shimada et al. neither disclose an insulating layer forming between the pixel electrode and the common electrode nor compensation film and method of forming pretilt angle by light.

One skilled in the art would have realized the desire to form an interlayer between two electrodes (e.g, pixel and common electrodes) for insulating such two electrodes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to form a common electrode under an insulating layer and a pixel electrode over the insulating layer in order to avoid cross-talk between two different electrodes.

Xu et al. do disclose in figures 1-3 that an optical compensation film (e.g, positive or negative) can be disposed between a substrate and a polaziring film. In addition, Kim et al. disclose a pretilt angle formed by polarized light (fig. 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to employ the optical compensation film in the Shimada et al. device in order to improve viewing characteristics (Xu et al., abstract) as well a to form a pretilt angle on the surface of an alignment layer since it is a common practice in the art to form a pretilt angle on the large size LCD device (Kim et al., abstract).

Application/Control Number: 09/852,077 Page 6

Art Unit: 2871

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Dung Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-0423. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 746-7730.

Any information of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

DN 11/19/2001

KENNETH PARKER
PRIMARY EXAMINER